



Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

Office of PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

Meeting of September 8, 1986

Present: Members Chaput, Sillers, Sherr, Raftery, Clarke and Leask

The minutes of August 25, 1986 were read and it was suggested that those minutes reflect the fact that member Clarke was present. The minutes were moved for approval as amended. That motion was duly seconded and unanimously approved.

ANR Plan for Doerfer on Concord Street

A plan drawn by Nelson Engineering showing one lot of 18.84 acres, dated November 15, 1985, showing existing lot lines was presented. This is not a division of land, but rather a plan showing existing lot lines. The plan was unanimously approved.

Woodbine Road

Discussion of sidewalk on Woodbine Road upon which the Board previously voted (5-2) to request removal of the sidewalk. Several neighbors had requested that the Board rescind its vote to request removal. Parenthetically, the letter to the developer requesting removal has not been sent to Mr. Ludwin, the developer. Mrs. Hocker's letter is in the file; she argued in favor of her request. A motion was made to rescind the vote requesting the developer to remove the sidewalk. The motion was duly seconded. Mr. Ludwin stated that the contractor worked from the plan and did consult with a Mr. Provost of CV&P. The developer has believed that the sidewalks were built in accordance with CV&P's suggestions in the field. He also pointed out that CV&P has not complained about the sidewalk and has indicated that the sidewalk is built generally in accordance with the plan. On the issue of whether the path was to be "winding" vis-a-vis a straight sidewalk, Mr. Ludwin stated that the engineers spoke to each other and to Mrs. Mortensen. The purpose was to save as many trees as possible. Mrs. Mortensen advised the Board that the sidewalk if left as meandering might be a hazard to small children. She believes that the present path is appropriate and acceptable as built. She never authorized anyone to represent to the Board that she favored removal of the sidewalk. Man

Mark Phillippo of East Street spoke in favor of retaining the sidewalk to avoid the hazards of traffic on East Street when strolling or walking children. He believes that the subdivision road is narrow and the sidewalk is a necessity in light of construction activity in the subdivision. He believes that there is a blind spot in the road which would be dangerous to children if the sidewalk is removed.

Mr. Schecter expressed that he was also concerned about safety, but he felt that the sidewalk was also a safety hazard being that it lacked a separation from the road and that it would attract children to it. Mrs. Chaput opined that the sidewalk was designed to provide safety for children to a school bus point.

Andy Hocker spoke in favor of the sidewalk pointing out that children do use it. David Guiney is the builder of the houses in the area; he said buyers preferred the availability of the sidewalk. Removal would not be in the best interests of the neighborhood, he stated. Member Clarke grew up in a subdivision without sidewalks and there are other examples of areas without sidewalks. Mr. Schecter summed his arguments and recommended a separation between the sidewalk and the street. Mr. Fortier stated that the changing of the location would mean significant regrading. Mr. Schecter wanted the sidewalk to be concealed. Concerning welling of the trees, Mr. Ludwin indicated that he planted some hemlocks, but he has been building in accordance with the plans. Additionally, the sidewalk is outside the subdivision and it was built in accordance with the request of the Board. Mr. Ludwin was reminded of his August 13, 1984 statement about a meandering path by Mr. Clarke. However, the contractor did not build a meandering path. Mr. Ludwin suggested that the Board should have built a meandering path. Mrs. Hocker said underground cables probably have as great an impact on tree health. The motion was amended to request of Mr. Ludwin that trees be welled and hemlocks be planted. Specifically, Mr. Clarke and Mr. Ludwin will identify which trees are to be welled. The amendment was moved and seconded and unanimously passed. The motion deadlocked at 3-3 and did not pass. Mr. Ludwin requested a reconsideration at a time when the full board is present. Mrs. Chaput agreed that it will be reconsidered at that point; she would poll board members to ascertain when all members would be present. Not all of the audience was delighted with the decision and a firm hand was required by the Chairperson to restore order so that the meeting could continue uninterrupted by irate neighbors.

Patch Meadow Subdivision

It appears that the application fee was not filed with the definitive subdivision plan. Mr. Tripodakis corrected this with a check. Now it appears that the application is missing also. This agenda item is the vote on the common driveway application which could not be voted last time because only 4 members could vote upon it. Mr. Tripodakis will correct the subdivision plans to delineate the driveway (common) thereon. A written request was made to extend the approval to September 22, 1986.

ANR Plan for Sorli

A plan showing Lot B-1 on a plan drawn by Stamski and McNary dated September 8, 1986 for Lawrence O. Sorli. The plan was unanimously approved upon a motion duly made and seconded.

Roger Kane - Martin Street Common Driveway

Mr. Kane indicated that the driveway is nearly complete. This will be an agenda item on September 22, 1986, to determine whether the drive is built in accordance with the plan.

Common Driveway on North Road

A Mr. Shea of 1135 North Road complained about a common driveway creating a drainage problem on the beginning of the driveway. It was suggested that Mr. Shea contact the engineering firm of Stamski and McNary and review the maintenance covenant with their attorney.

Elizabeth Ridge

Attorney Steven Graham asked the Board to sign the plans short one signature so that he may make a Land Court date. The subdivision was moved for approval for signatures holding back one (Mr. Raftery's) until the three items: (1) Selectmen's Approval, (2) Trail Easement and (3) Dismissal are provided.

Hayes Farm - Concord Street

An application for a Common Driveway was submitted but we do not know whether a subdivision plan has been filed. The public hearing was scheduled for September 22, 1986, but advertisements cannot be placed for that date. The public hearing will be scheduled for October 6 on the subdivision and common driveway applications.

Clark Farm Conservation Cluster

George Foote presented a vividly colored plan graphically describing the two proposed conservation clusters. He also showed a driveway plan for the common driveway. It will be 16 feet wide with 2-foot shoulders.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas J. Raftery